

Provincial Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH)

Online and Phone

Needs Assessment Survey Report



Prepared by Barbara M. Gravinese for

HERITAGE FOUNDATION OF
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

2008

ICH 2008 Survey Report Overview

Intent and Methodology

As a first step in fulfilling its ICH programme, Dale Jarvis, Intangible Cultural Heritage Development Officer, implemented a province-wide needs assessment survey, conducted by phone between 15 July and 1 October 2008. The survey used was developed collaboratively then entered into “Survey Monkey,” a free on-line survey server. A link directly to the survey was placed on HFNL’s homepage and the survey was advertised widely via various member email lists. Except for the few not contacted directly, respondents were chosen at random from a master list developed from lists solicited for the occasion. These lists were of persons directly or indirectly involved with cultural heritage, tourism, archival collections, governmental, museums, crafts, education, other community organizations and individuals in private business in Newfoundland and Labrador. The survey consisted of three sections with from three to six questions each, and took from ten to twenty-five minutes each. Open-ended questions were provided to encourage respondents to use their own words.

Every effort was made to reflect the province’s ethnic and religious diversity including new immigrant organizations. Religious organizations surveyed felt their ICH was secure as it is regularly practiced within their communities. Care was taken to reflect the expansive geography of the province and all regions of Newfoundland and Labrador are represented in this report. Respondents totaled one hundred-two (102) people with fewer than 20% taking the on-line survey independently.

Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador
Provincial Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH)
2008
Online and Phone Needs Assessment Survey Report

Barbara M. Gravinese

Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador
Provincial Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH)
2008 Online and Phone Needs Assessment Survey Report

I. Executive Summary

As its first step in implementing its Intangible Cultural Heritage Newfoundland and Labrador Strategic Plan, the Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador (HFNL), under the direction of Dale Jarvis, Intangible Cultural Heritage Development Officer, conducted a province-wide needs assessment survey by phone, between 15 July and 1 October 2008. The implemented survey was developed collaboratively by Dale Jarvis, ICH Development Officer, Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador, Jerry A. Dick, Director of Heritage, Department of Tourism, Culture and Recreation, Dr. Gerald Pocius, F. S. R. C., cross-appointed in the Departments of Folklore and Archeology, Memorial University of Newfoundland (MUN), and myself, Barbara Gravinese, Department of Folklore, (MUN), Ph. D. candidate. Respondents totaled one hundred-two (102), most contacted directly by phone, with fewer than 20% taking the on-line survey independently, and most of them responding to publicity sent out by Dale, or a telephone message left to on their message machine by me when they could not be reached otherwise. Except for the few unknown to me who took the survey, respondents were chosen at random from a master list developed from lists solicited for the occasion from and included persons directly or indirectly involved with cultural heritage, tourism, archival collections, museums, crafts organizations, educational institutions, the botanic gardens, heritage sites, municipal and regional offices, and other public and private organizations in Newfoundland and Labrador. Every effort was made to reflect the

province's ethnic and religious diversity by calling Inuit, Innu, Métis, First Nations, and other aboriginal groups, as well as Chinese-Canadian and other newer immigrant organizations. Religious organizations surveyed include Christian, Muslim, Jewish, and Buddhist, though on the whole they felt their traditions were secure as practiced within their communities. Care was also taken to reflect the expansive geography of the province and all regions of Newfoundland and Labrador are represented in this report.

In addition to questions asked, the survey served as a welcome opportunity for all respondents to discuss their ongoing work in the area of ICH, and they seemed to appreciate having the opportunity to share their experience and ideas as well as having them valued. True to the generous nature and affable qualities of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, all those I called were patient and good natured with their time and responses, happy to educate me in what I was not familiar, and give me names of neighbors and others I should call. The survey was seen by many almost as a “kick-off,” or in one respondent's words, “a starting point” for the future of this province's official ICH development. During discussions around open-ended questions, respondents were often familiar with the cultural heritage work of Dale Jarvis, as they referenced programming, storytelling or community presentations such as, “Doors Open,” “Historic Houses,” or “The Haunted Hike.” These programmes, they said, have helped educate people about folklore and traditional cultural heritage, and have helped to increase membership and volunteerism in community cultural heritage activities.¹ Though the survey was online and widely available, it seems it was very helpful to have a call come

¹ Answers to open ended questions on the definition of ICH in respondents' words can be found in full as appendices A-D.

in to invite people to take the survey with them. It certainly gave people the opportunity to ask questions and engage in discussion.

The salient points from the results of the survey include that a majority of respondents identified themselves as representing a heritage or historical society, a museum, archive, municipality, aboriginal organization, craft council or organization. This was not surprising as it reflects the organizational lists used to develop our call list. However only slightly less than half the respondents identified as “other.” Most of these included other organizations such as schools, combined municipalities and heritage sites, and organizations, and unaffiliated individuals. The survey also informs us that a majority of people contacted did have some knowledge of ICH, though some still confuse tangible cultural heritage and intangible cultural heritage with each other. The following is a sampling of a composite of terms respondents used most frequently to describe ICH are: non-physical; our culture that can’t be touched or held in your hand; what grows here; how people live their lives; language; dialects; sense of place; music; songs; oral traditions; and skills passed from generation to generation.² Almost three-quarters of those surveyed stated their organization or community is currently undertaking an ICH project, and of its type, most said they were “Documenting or celebrating local traditional knowledge, skills, cultural practices, or tradition-bearers.” More than half of the respondents stated they would be undertaking an ICH project within “the year,” repeating that the type of project would most likely be, “Documenting or celebrating local traditional knowledge, skills, cultural practices, or tradition-bearers,” with, “Transmission of knowledge or skills to younger generations,” a close second choice. In terms of needed

² Appendix A

resources, the great majority reported their greatest need was for “project funding,” as it provided greater flexibility and range than the other choices.

When asked how their community celebrates ICH and honors local tradition bearers, a few composite responses to this question are: by recording memoirs; on historic and nature tours/walks; at weekly, monthly, or annual events; at ethnic festivals and celebrations; at food fairs; performances; family events; and other public and small specialized group events, such as quilting or drumming circles.³ Only a few percentage points short of one hundred percent of respondents answered positively to desiring more information regarding ICH. When asked what form this should take, the majority of those chose “a printed information packet,” largely because it could be freely reproduced, put on display and circulated, adapted into other languages and inserted into newsletters. A majority of respondents felt that ICH in their community was in danger of being lost. A composite of responses when asked what these may be includes: skills associated with harvesting the land and sea, including net making, knowing good fishing areas, farming, knowledge of edible plants and what grows here, hunting and trapping, animal husbandry; traditional craft skills, such as grass work, Grenfell matt hooking, and seal skin boot making; building boats, homes, stages and sheds; subsistence living skills, such as preserving foods, and getting through the winter; oral traditions, such as recitations, storytelling styles; songmaking, and throat singing, and oral histories; and languages and dialects.

Again, almost all respondents expressed an interest in ICH training in standards and practices for recording and documenting their community’s ICH. (Appendix F –

³ Appendix B

Release Form Sample Copy; Appendix H – ICH Web Resources) Most of those said they would be interested in the half day “what is ICH workshop,” for themselves or other organization or community members, and the “two-day introduction to ICH fieldwork” for themselves and others. Some expressed interest in the “one to two week professional level training,” but had time constraints that would prevent them from attending. However, a surprising number of people did give their names to be contacted for the professional training.⁴ Asked if they thought we missed anything in the survey they would like to add, most said “no,” they felt we covered everything. Those that responded often reiterated things already mentioned, but some had additional comments. Some of these are: to stress “links to natural history,” an interest in seeing “small focus groups” in communities to help place ICH in their community more informally, another suggested the government improve roads to improve travel between heritage sites, and another asked for “ICH programming in the schools.”⁵

I will add a short note here strictly based on discussion quite a few people had with me. Some respondents identified their community as “resettlement” communities. As representatives of the generation “that remembers,” those who were children when they resettled, they express frustration that they do not have the resources to mentor their young in traditional skills they learned to value. These ranged from knowing where the fish are to needle arts and subsistence living. Aboriginal communities share this concern. Though they recognize this as the result of both resettlement programs and provincial schooling of the “in between” generation (often themselves) between traditional elder and today’s youth. Inclusively, their distress is palpable. All feel strongly that too much of

⁴ Appendix E.

⁵ Appendix D.

what they know and value from the past is losing an essential link, identified as today's youth. Not to say they did not say they understand that it is natural for young people "move on." It was more of a recognition that they themselves were "forgetting," and they are aware that the young will never miss what they never knew. Many said, "The people who remember are in their sixties, seventies and eighties now. In not much longer they will be gone."

Upon completing the survey, respondents were asked for permission for their responses to be used on behalf of non-profit programs generated by Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador in the future, and most did grant permission. I was able to delete the open-ended responses of those who denied permission, though most did not answer those questions, and some had abandoned the survey soon after starting. Only one respondent I interviewed in the end, refused permission. Open ended responses appear as appendices in the original words of respondents, with only formatting changes.

Special thanks to the Department of Tourism, Culture and Recreation for funding this project, and to Dr. Jerry L. Pocius, Department of Folklore, MUN, for contributing office space, computer, printer, and telephone for the purposes of the survey, and Natalie Falk, of the Association of Heritage Industries for preliminary discussions facilitating the passing of this initiative from their organization to Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador.

II. Survey Results

A. Introduction to Survey and types of respondents

After a brief introduction to the survey, including some explanatory notes and examples of intangible cultural heritage and what it is generally known to be, two

questions followed to establish the respondent in their community. Survey Monkey (SM) tracks the number of respondents, in this case one hundred (102), and indicates that eighty-three (83) “completed [the] survey,” meaning that all questions were answered. In the case of the ICH Needs Assessment Survey this is not relevant however, as it was not necessarily applicable for all respondents to answer all questions. Given this arbitrary demarcation, it is safe to say then that in the case of the ICH survey, 100% of all respondents completed our survey.

The survey’s first question asked for “**Name and/or Organization,**” answered by 93 respondents and skipped by 9. In our survey we have assured respondents we will not use their names or that of their organization in this report, or in subsequent uses of the survey. We assure that this portion of the survey is held as confidential and only with individual permission will the information be disclosed. Most inquires regarding the population surveyed here are satisfied by question two (2), which asks for “**Type of Organization,**” as it is useful to know from which segments of the population this report draws its information. Respondents were asked to choose between: heritage or historical society; museum; archive; municipality; aboriginal organization; craft council/organization; and other. In order of greatest percentages to least, 42% checked “other,” which we can read as a non-affiliated community member; an individual, owner/operator of a commercial enterprise; an organization engaged in some combination of other choices not willing to identify as one or the other; or a representative of an organization whose identity was not specifically specified, such as a resource centre, federal programme or strictly educational entity. Next, 19% identified as “heritage or historical society,” 18% as “museum,” 10.2% as aboriginal, 4% as “municipality” or

“archive,” 3% as “craft council/organization,” 42% identified as “other,” and two (2) respondents skipped the question.

B. ICH in Your Community

ICH in your community, section two, first asked, **“Are you familiar with the term, ‘Intangible Cultural Heritage,’** to which 72.9% answered “yes,” and 27.1% answered “no,” and 2% skipped the question. It may be assumed that of the 27.1% who answered “no” to this question, almost half (14%) actually had as much of an understanding of what ICH is as many who did claim to know. (Appendix G – Glossary of Terms) Those who responded positively were asked, **“How would you describe or define ICH,”** in their own words. Respondents who felt they understood what ICH is most often described it as: living history or heritage; non-physical; non-tangible; custom; tradition; stories, customs, and culture passed down from generation to generation; oral; oral transmission; felt (sensed), can’t be touched, not seen, non-material; crafts, skills, songs, music, dances; embodied; exchange; intergenerational; and that it “exists all around us.” Less typical but of note, respondents added “place,” “our way of life,” “the plants that grow here,” “how we have survived in this place,” to the list. (Appendix A)

In response to the question, **“Is your organization currently undertaking a project or program related to recording, showcasing, or the transmission of aspects of your community’s ICH,”** 71% answered positively, 29% answered negatively, and nine (9) skipped this question. Some I spoke to who skipped the question volunteered that they would like to but they don’t have community resources critical to undertake a project, this included people and/or money. It was a frequent complaint among respondents working in cultural heritage, that they do not have the many power and or

financial resources to hire and train young people over summer months for them to mentor. An interest in outside training for these students was also expressed. This loss of opportunity to capture the attention of youth, who might later continue their tangible and intangible cultural heritage work, was expressed as a deep regret. In a sense one might say that in this they express and identify an overriding intangible cultural heritage of Newfoundland and Labrador, that of elder passing on traditional skills to youth.

When asked **“What type of project is it?”** 75.4% stated they have plans to “document or celebrate local traditional knowledge, skills, cultural practices, or tradition-bearers; 69.2% indicated they have plans for the “transmission of knowledge or skills to younger generations;” 61.5% plan to “record or document ICH;” 35.4% have plans to encourage local business opportunities using local traditional knowledge, practices, or skills.” The area of stimulating local business sometimes challenged respondents. This may be said to highlight the “invisibility factor” of ICH and how difficult it can be to perceive its wide-ranging influence and benefit in communities. Thirty-seven (37) respondents skipped this question. At least 75% of those who have plans for ICH community projects have been engaged in on-going projects for five (5) years or more. Among those who skipped this question, some stated they were in the early stages of centennial anniversaries, and knew their resources would be entirely devoted to events past one year. Others among those who skipped the question expressed a desire to have a community project this coming year, but said they lacked resources. The next question, **“How likely is your organization to undertake such a project within the next year?”** 65.9% responded they were sure they or their community would be involved in a project,

some of them well established annual events, and 11.4% reported they would be least likely. The remaining 22.8% were less sure.

C. Community Needs

Asking of those who do have plans for an ICH project in their community within the year, **“If you plan to undertake a community ICH project, into which category would it fit?”** 69.35 responded they would be “Documenting or celebrating local traditional knowledge, skills, cultural practices, or tradition-bearers,” 61% that they would be involved in the, “Transmission of knowledge or skills to younger generations,” 54.7% they would be, “Recording or documenting of ICH,” and 33.3% they would be “Encouraging local business opportunities using local traditional knowledge, practices, or skills.” Twenty-seven respondents skipped this question.

In response to the question on community needs, **“If you plan to undertake an ICH project, what kinds of resources or supports would you require?”** all but those who received other funding, such as Parks Canada or other federally funded programs, 88.5% request “project funding.” 79.5% request “project funding to hire field workers;” 75.6% request both “special equipment including video cameras and audio recorders” and assistance in “documenting or celebrating traditional knowledge;” 70.5% request “technical expertise, training or information on best practices for recording information;” 67.9% request resources and support for “educational programs for children or youth;” 55.1% request “support for business entrepreneurs seeking to build on traditional knowledge and skill;” and twenty-two (22) respondents skipped this question.

This was followed by an open-ended question in which people were asked, **“How does your community celebrate or recognize ICH or people skilled and**

knowledgeable in your community's cultural traditions?" Here we see responses to be less general, reflecting more of the province's ethnic and occupational cultural diversity as focus shifts between people and their local environment. (Appendix B) The ways communities celebrate and recognize their community's ICH and/or people skilled and knowledgeable in cultural traditions will be distilled here and can be said to occur, if they do at all, at annual events, such as festivals, dinners, centennials, and other regularly or seasonally held gatherings, they are built into public and private educational programs for youth, adults, and tourists, they occur within the context of special historical occupational events, such as demonstrations of sheep shearing and wool spinning, or among skilled groups such as craftspeople, they occur at life events, such as christenings and funerals, at intimate family occasions, and on rare occasion an individual is honored by name in a public event, often posthumously. It should be noted that when reading the responses for this question, the responses do not often mention a formal celebration or event as they list "what" and "how" they feel their community celebrates ICH. Many respondents knew events occurred but did not necessarily know details, as they themselves more often represented organizations that did not "celebrate" per se, but housed artifacts. The ensuing list can be read as the visible types of ICH at annual events, anniversaries, or festivals, or components of ongoing events, such as local heritage tours, Botanic Garden, community, or school programming. We see "Storytelling" or "stories" came up as a means of celebrating traditional knowledge, though it was stated to be less formal, more often occurring spontaneously in small groups. Outside the formal event which honors and celebrates the skills and contributions of others, recognition was most often achieved in communities in ways more integral to community life, such as a highly

skilled quilter being recognized among their peers, or a storyteller in a family being honored among family members.

The final section of the survey is, **“More Information,”** which seeks to learn the level of interest in learning more about ICH among respondents. Respondents could indicate more than one, recognizing that to some degree they spoke for their organization and community, with different needs and understanding of ICH. An enthusiastic 94.1% said they and/or their organization would be interested in “receiving additional information about safeguarding ICH,” and of those 62.3% were interested in receiving a printed package, 59.5% in information on a website, 59.2% in a presentation in community or region, and 13.2% said “other.” Of 102 respondents, 20 skipped this question. Respondents recognized and spoke of the advantages of each of these choices saying they felt printed material gave them something to reproduce for distribution and to study for newsletter briefs, information on the web might be more accessible to homebound, working and school age people, community or regional presentations allowed people to ask questions and interact with the topic and presenter, making it “real.” The two (2) respondents who indicated “other,” were not interviewed by me, and as this was not an open-ended question I have no other information. In that case we may say that 22 people skipped this question.

“Are there aspects of your community’s traditional cultural practices, traditions, knowledge or skills that you feel are at a considerable risk of being lost?”

(Appendix C) The following list highlights responses: traditional crafts, French, Aboriginal, First Nations languages, Irish, and vernacular English particular to Newfoundland and Labrador; traditional crafts, music making, recitation, dances;

cooking, preserving and baking foods; subsistence living skills; occupational skills such as animal husbandry; non-instrumental nautical navigation and terminology, seamanship, fish processing, jigging cod, where the fishing grounds are; traditional hunting, fishing and trapping, skinning animals and preparing hides, seal skin boot making; knitting fish nets and clothing, the “trigger thumb knit,” other needle arts such as Grenfell matt hooking, embroidery and making tea dolls; informal play for children, games, jokes; the clothes line; oral traditions; traditional values and ethics; storytelling and stories; building boats, homes, canoes, sheds and stages; Powwow, cultural landscapes, gardening by the sea using seaweed and shells, blacksmithing, skills required to live ear-round, personal and family work stories, and helping others.

D. More Information

Responses to the next question, **“On a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being the least valuable and 5 being the most, to what degree would training on standards and practices for recording aspects of your community’s Intangible Cultural Heritage be valuable for your group or community?”** 61.4% said it rated a “5,” that it was most important, 21.7% felt it was important, 15.7% felt it was less so, and 1.2% even less, with 0% not thinking it was not important at all. Nineteen (19) people skipped this question. Some that skipped this question or answered on the low side of interest included those who did not feel the question applied to their circumstances, or did not feel they could speak for their community. The next question, **“If “yes,” assuming cost was not a factor, which would be preferable?** Responses were 57.3% for the “two day ‘Introduction to ICH Fieldwork,’” 56.1% for the “half-day workshop,” 47.6% for “computer-based training and information,” and 40.2% for the “Advanced 1-2 Week

Professional Training/Fieldschool.” The surprise here was the large number interested in professional training, and this number would have been greater but some felt they could not get the time off from their primary responsibilities to attend. To assure those interested would receive future information on training, a list of names and contact information was compiled. (Appendix E) We see about a 12% discrepancy between those interested in “information” on the web and those interested “training” on the web, with fewer interested in “training.” Twenty (20) people skipped this question.

Before asking for participant permission to use the results of the survey without using names, and closing, respondents were asked, **“Is there anything we've missed, or that you think is important in terms of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in Newfoundland and Labrador?”** This question sparked ideas resulting from the taking of the survey and seemed to act as a forum for grievances and afterthoughts. Several more than half of respondents answered they felt the survey covered the topic well, and had no further thoughts. Of the thirty (30) that added thoughts, one stated that the roads should be improved between communities so the tourist trade can travel from place to place with greater ease, one felt the west coast was “fragmented,” with “few resources,” and “needs more of an innovative approach like in the Northern Peninsula,” another indicated there were “bad feelings regarding inaccessible archives,” because community members who were recorded could not afford to travel to St. John’s to the Center for Newfoundland Studies archive and they were refused copies,” one spoke of people not seeing the value in what they have around them “here,” another felt “cooperage” was a neglected topic, the importance of natural resources was mentioned, funding for student tours and special events, geographical changes over time, how present-day artisans are

interpreting the older traditional crafts and skills, a MMaP representative said they would be interested in a collaboration with the ICH initiative, curiosity about the new immigrant ICH and how it may alter what's here was expressed, and that, "In the case of Aboriginal Organizations, any training, collection, preservation, and dissemination needs to follow traditional cultural norms and values." (Appendix D)

Those that responded to the question of agreeing to permit the use of the material collected, responded "yes." Twenty three (23) respondents skipped this question. While their responses are calculated into the statistics, the responses to open-ended questions by those who denied use of their responses are deleted from this report.

III. Conclusion and Recommendations

In conclusion, I believe the province-wide ICH phone survey was a great success. The following three recommendations and suggestions are based on survey results and conversation with respondents: (1) ICH recognition awards for community members who are identifying and safeguarding; (2) support of community performance and traditional crafts programming in educational settings; and (3) an on-going, cross-disciplinary, multi-tiered ICH training program, to include k-12 teacher training.

The fact that the survey itself stimulated discussion while it publicized the ICH initiative seemed important to many respondents, especially those who have deeply committed themselves to cultural heritage in their community. Based on this interaction, my first observation is that while we speak of honoring the tradition-bearers, we do not speak of honoring those who have worked in their communities in cultural heritage, and in this instance ICH. Therefore, my first recommendation is that the ICH initiative finds opportunities to shift the focus from the tradition bearer to those who help identify and

create community opportunities that nurture ICH. This can be done perhaps by presenting certificates of appreciation in a public venue to these dedicated people. Independent of the survey, respondents spoke of isolation, lack of resources, fear of no one continuing their work, and many years of devoted work that remains basically unacknowledged. This is not to say that anyone complained when none did. Many of these people have been captured by name on the professional training list, but as this was a random survey of only one-hundred-two Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, we know this list represents only a small number of active and retired people working on the grass-roots level of this initiative. The initiatives ability to show appreciation to these “foot soldiers” will be appreciated and benefit the initiative. Each person I spoke with was appreciative of having the opportunity to tell me what they were doing, and for many it has been their life’s work.

The second conclusion I have reached from speaking with those I called, is that educating youth is a priority for cultural continuity. Everyone I spoke with from the province, learned traditional ways as children on into adulthood. While times have changed and with it tasks of survival and employment, most mourned the inability to pass on traditions and values they felt were unique and critical to “a good and meaningful life here.” Some cited regrets that with Confederation came an embarrassment of their ICH here and a loss of pride in “old ways.” When we say ICH is “dynamic,” we are speaking of the “living” aspects of cultural heritage. While we cannot recreate the circumstances that generated many cultural intangibles and traditions of past generations, youth can be encouraged to learn traditional ICH with pride along with its values, and as all things grow, to consider ways of adapting traditional ICH to their current living circumstances.

To offset a natural inclination for youth to focus out, on the world “out there,” and a lack of pride in local traditional ways, respondents suggested that performance arts and traditional crafts offer a wide range of possibilities for open exchange of local intangible cultural heritage, while cultivating character and personality.

One kind of performance often mentioned was the art of storytelling. Children love to tell and hear stories and they enjoy having opportunities to practice telling tales of wonder and amazement about the world, and the “telling” and “listening” are both important ways in which young people make sense of the world. Their natural inclination to be amazed and their love of drama make them naturals for storytelling, riddles, jokes telling, recitations, and theatre. In the schools and communities that already has such programming or events; the ICH initiative has an opportunity to support them in this by creating awards for competitions. Awards in the form of a certificate and small monetary award for a wide range of “winners” would be appropriate. Some respondents I spoke with held childhood memories of similar competitions, suggesting that communities with those that “remember” design the contest and other communities be offered opportunities to share these contest designs and perhaps even compete against each other on a regional basis. Traditional crafts of carving and building, of grass work, and the newer traditions of weaving, pottery making, and metal working, involve valuable skills for developing bodies and minds. In all these suggestions, cooperation, and community, and occupation are several elements at play, which studies have shown are helpful in deterring early experimentation with alcohol and drugs, which after all in it is just another culture. If we are considering distracting youth from now commonplace pervasive high-tech excitement

and relative passivity and isolation, we are faced with making ICH exciting, attractive, daring, and a forum for self-expression and competition.

Saving the most important for last, is my recommendation to supports training as pivotal to and already integral to the ICH initiative underway. All survey evidence supports the fact that communities in all regions of the province of Newfoundland and Labrador are ripe for taking the next step in learning to identify ICH in their communities, receiving further information and training in recording and documenting ICH, and celebrating and safeguarding ICH using ethical standards and practices. Training is critical to build upon the respect for the province's inherent value for the creative way of life as a respected tradition unique to individuals and communities, as is apparent in all responses to this survey. Training on all levels is appropriate. On the basic level training will help people understand and identify ICH in their immediate environs, and will help to gain popular support of initiative programming and funding. Time constraints were often determinants in the choices some respondents made for training opportunities. To meet this need the ICH initiative is planning customized workshops and training programmes to be negotiated on a community level. People were very interested in learning about the "professional" way of collecting, documenting and recording ICH. It must be stressed that many communities have their own strong ethical codes and private/public ideals to be learned of beforehand and taken into consideration, and must be taken into account.

Those that attend the one to two week professional training fieldschools should receive certification to educate and train people in ICH in their communities, as well as have an option to become a regional liaison. Training school teachers to teach ICH will

help to bring ICH to children and ideally will follow their education from kindergarten to senior high school. With the expected success of a “train-the-trainers program,” one can expect that fewer problems will arise where tradition bearers are taken unfair advantage of, making the ICH initiative one that gains in respect as it grows and is welcome around the province, especially important as tourism and entrepreneurial business enterprise is encouraged and supported.

I would venture to say that the ICH survey has excited expectations for additional resources being made available to communities all around the province. However, that being said, all respondents gave the distinct impression that they felt that what they had to offer in return was of at least equal value. Indeed, the Intangible Cultural Heritage of traditional skills and knowledge unique to a time and place, are intimate expressions of a people and are priceless.